

patenting rejection over '939 in view of Hashimoto and further in view of U.S. Patent No: 6,649,834 to Hsieh et al. (Hsieh).

Regarding the non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejections, Applicants respectfully assert that the '939 application is assigned to Fuji Xerox. A Terminal Disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) is filed with this response.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5-15 and 19-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hsieh in view of Hashimoto; and rejects claims 4 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hsieh in view of Hashimoto and further in view of JP 7-38138 to Oyoshi. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action at page 9, lines 14-15, acknowledges that Hsieh does not teach an electrode extending through the insulative substrate, as recited in independent claim 1, but asserts that Hashimoto may be relied upon to fill that deficiency.

During the July 11 interview, Applicants asserted and the Examiner agreed that modifying the device described in Hsieh to include electrodes that pass through the insulative substrate, as taught by Hashimoto, would obviate the benefits described in Hsieh at col. 4, lines 28-49, thereby changing the principle of operation of the device in Hsieh and/or rendering the device in Hsieh unsatisfactory for its intended purpose.

Specifically, combining the device described in Hsieh with the electrode structure described in Hashimoto would adversely affect, or render useless, any benefit derived from the improved mechanical bond and improved electrical connection related to use of a surface mounting approach in which solder climbs the third board 44 (i.e., the vertical portion of metal sheet electrode 30). In addition, such a combination would reduce benefits of reduced material and manufacturing costs related to the use of an injection molded structure with no

adhesives (i.e., that replaces the conventional device substrate through which the external electrodes in Hashimoto are designed to project through). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would not have been motivated to combine the two references.

Oyoshi does not overcome the above-noted deficiencies in the application of Hsieh and Hashimoto to the subject matter of the pending claims.

For at least this reason, the combination of all of the features recited in independent claim 1 is neither taught, nor would it have been suggested, by any combination of the applied prior art references. Claim 15 includes features similar to those described above with respect to claim 1 and, therefore would not have been suggested by any combination of the applied prior art references for at least the same reasons. Claims 2-14 and 16-23 depend from one of independent claims 1 and 15, and as such, are also neither taught, nor would they have been suggested, by any combination of the applied prior art references for at least the respective dependence of these claims directly or indirectly on independent claims 1 and 15, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over any combination of the applied prior art references are respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion


As indicated above, Applicants' representatives presented the above arguments to Examiner Monbleau during the July 11 personal interview. The Examiner indicated that she found the arguments persuasive, but also indicated that a further prior art search would be required upon Applicants filing of a formal response. Applicants' representatives noted that any reference that the Examiner might find that disclosed electrodes penetrating through the

substrate would, in Applicants' opinion, not be combinable with Hsieh to the same extent that Hashimoto is not combinable, for the reasons indicated above.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-23 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Daniel A. Tanner, III
Registration No. 54, 734

JAO:DAT/axl

Attachments:

Petition for Extension of Time
Terminal Disclaimer

Date: July 31, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461